

Math and Science Partnership

2016-2017 Proposal Reviews

Date				
Proposal #				
Reviewer Name				
LEA/Fiscal Agent				
Are any required components missing?		No	Yes	
If yes, which one(s)?				
Focus Area of the RFP (check all that apply)				
<input type="checkbox"/> Improving elementary and middle school (K-8) educators' mathematical content knowledge in one or more domains, with a focus on the major work of the grade.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Increasing understanding of the standards, progressions, coherence, and pedagogical opportunities for the Integrated Mathematics Pathway in high school.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Deepening the understanding and the use of modeling as a means to promote reasoning and critical thinking in mathematics, science, career and technical education, and/or STEM classrooms				
<input type="checkbox"/> Increase understanding of how collaboration between mathematics, science, and career technical courses can deepen subject area content knowledge in science and mathematics as well as expand students' readiness for college and/or careers.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Expand understanding of science through scientific reading and writing within the content area.				
Subject:	Math	Science	Other (please specify)	
Grade Levels:	K-5	6-8	9-12	Higher Ed

REQUIREMENTS

Requirements:	Met/Not Met
Project includes at least one LEA that meets the high need definition (defined below)	
Partnership includes at least one IHE department of math, science, or engineering	
Proposal includes evidence of consultation with private schools during planning process	

Proposals must meet all 3 requirements above to advance to Section II of review.

High Need School District(s): At least one LEA must meet one or more of the following criteria:

- The district TVAAS composite is 1, 2, or 3 in overall numeracy in targeted grade; OR
- The district is below the state average for the percent of students Proficient or Advanced in: 3-8 math, algebra I, algebra II, 3-8 science, or biology.

Evaluation Rubric

Project Abstract (5 points possible)				
Indicator	Exceeds Minimum Requirements 5 points	Meets Requirements 3 points	Does Not Meet Requirements 1 point	Points Awarded
Project Abstract	A strong abstract will identify project lead and key program initiative(s) as well as outline how activities will lead to goal attainment.	Abstract identifies project lead and key program initiative(s).	Little or no clarity about the project need or purpose or lack of clarity on project leadership.	
TOTAL POINTS				
JUSTIFICATION / COMMENTS (REQUIRED):				
Evidence of Meaningful Partnerships (10 points possible)				
Indicator	Exceeds Minimum Requirements 5 points	Meets Requirements 3 points	Does Not Meet Requirements 1 point	Points Awarded
Identifies primary and supporting partners	At least one IHE engineering, mathematics, or science department and at least one high-need school district are identified as primary partners who will implement the project and be accountable for its outcomes. Supporting partners are clearly identified and roles defined as applicable.	At least one IHE engineering, mathematics, or science department and at least one high-need school district are identified as primary partners but additional partners' roles are not clearly defined.	Partners are named, but an IHE engineering, mathematics, or science department is not specifically listed OR primary and supporting partners are not identified.	
Documents active planning and involvement of all primary partners	Planning is clearly documented with dates, locations, and names of individuals from each primary partner. It is evident that collaboration and planning among and between all	Planning is described but not clearly documented. Most of the primary partners are involved during the planning of the proposal. The level of commitment	No documentation of dates, locations, and names of individuals is provided. The level of commitment of primary partners to the project is not evident. Planning and proposal writing seems to	

	primary partners has occurred with sufficient frequency and attendance to establish a meaningful partnership during or prior to the writing of this proposal. Attendees at planning meetings are appropriate representatives for the nature of the project.	of primary partners is evident for some but not all.	be the work of a small group of individuals without inclusion or input from all primary partners.	
TOTAL POINTS				
POINT JUSTIFICATION/REVIEW COMMENTS (REQUIRED):				
Results of Needs Assessment (15 points possible)				
Indicator	Exceeds Minimum Requirements 5 points	Meets Requirements 3 points	Does Not Meet Requirements 1 point	Points Awarded
Multiple sources of relevant and current data as methods of identifying teachers/schools/districts needs	Multiple relevant sources of current data (within past 2 years)—both qualitative and quantitative—are presented/referenced (e.g., EOC, AP, drop-out rate, retention rates, number of students taking advanced classes, successful post-secondary transition, student/teacher surveys, etc.).	Adequate sources of data are presented/referenced OR only qualitative or only quantitative data are presented	No specific data are presented OR only anecdotal data are presented OR all data presented are more than 2 years old.	
Identifies specific gaps or weaknesses in teacher content knowledge/practice	Relevant sources of data in math/science for both teachers and students in targeted grades are disaggregated and analyzed. Student data clearly identify specific content areas in need of improvement. Teacher data clearly identify specific gaps in teacher knowledge and practice.	Data analysis in math and/or science is included and disaggregated for the targeted grades but does not include both student and teacher data OR does not clearly identify gaps or weaknesses in teacher content knowledge and practice.	Data are presented but not analyzed OR only superficial 'reading' of the data is presented OR data presented are not current or reliable (i.e., only anecdotal reports from a small subset of students/teachers/districts are presented). Specific gaps or weaknesses in teacher content knowledge/practice are not identified.	
Aligns needs identified and data presented	The narrative builds a clear picture of a small set of specific needs to be	Need statements are well documented but are general rather	Need statements are <u>not</u> well documented or are <u>not</u> supported by the	

	addressed by the project. Data presented have a clear and direct relationship to these needs, with no extraneous data provided (e.g., AP enrollment data in a proposal addressing K-5).	than specific. The overall set of data presented are <u>not</u> clearly aligned with needs stated.	data presented.	
TOTAL POINTS				
POINT JUSTIFICATION/REVIEW COMMENTS (REQUIRED):				
Project Objectives (15 points possible)				
Indicator	Exceeds Minimum Requirements 5 points	Meets Requirements 3 points	Does Not Meet Requirements 1 point	Points Awarded
States specific measurable objectives for the four goals required in the RFP: 1) increasing teacher content knowledge; 2) increasing student achievement; 3) improving classroom instruction; and 4) developing a sustainable partnership. Additional measurable objectives are stated if appropriate.	Clear and measurable objectives are stated for each of the four required goals. Objectives are ambitious, yet realistic in scope.	Some of the objectives appear to support the goals stated in the RFP. Some of the objectives are not measurable or realistic in scope.	Objectives are not specific or measurable or realistic in scope.	
Aligns all stated objectives with needs identified	Objectives are specifically linked to the identified learning needs of both teachers and students.	Objectives are generally linked to the identified teacher or student learning needs.	Objectives are not clearly linked with the needs assessment. Some needs identified are not addressed in the objectives, or vice versa.	
Describes objectives in terms of measurable participant outcomes and in year-long increments	Objectives are stated in terms of measurable participant outcomes, with regular milestones stated so the project	Most objectives are measurable outcomes and are written in regular increments but may be difficult to	Objectives are stated in terms of activity completion rather than participant outcomes OR are not measurable. No means of	

	can assess progress towards goals on an annual basis.	evaluate both qualitatively and quantitatively on a regular basis.	assessing progress on a regular basis is evident.	
TOTAL POINTS				
POINT JUSTIFICATION/REVIEW COMMENTS (REQUIRED):				
Implementation Plan (40 points possible)				
Indicator	Exceeds Minimum Requirements 5 points	Meets Requirements 3 points	Does Not Meet Requirements 1 point	Points Awarded
Provides a detailed description of the target audience including how participants will be selected and retained	Describes in detail who the participants are including subject areas, grade levels, numbers of participants to be served and how they will attend (as individuals, grade level teams, school teams, etc.). Also describes participant selection process, emphasizing how those with the greatest need will be incentivized to participate and strategies to be implemented to encourage retention in the project.	Identifies participant group, but lacks either a detailed description of who they are or how they were selected or will be retained.	Participants are identified, but lacks both a description of how/why they were selected and how they will be encouraged to stick with the project.	
States the focus area for the project Defines professional development design clearly in terms of summer institutes, graduate courses, on-line courses, workshops, coaching, etc.	The PD focus area is clearly stated and PD design is defined. A detailed description of each major component is provided including total number of instructional hours as well as duration, focus areas, structure, and the roles of each partner in development and implementation of each.	The PD focus area is clearly stated and PD design is defined. A description of design components is provided for all major components and activities and their implementation. Description lacks some of the detail needed for the reader to replicate the PD implementation plan.	PD focus area and design may or may not be clearly stated. Activities are not likely to be effective. Project activities may or may not be aligned to the TN Academic Standards.	
Describes the design and implementation of major components and activities	Included is a description of how each component will 1) engage teachers with content at a level	Most activities are likely to be effective but one or two have been included that are of	Project activities are included that are of questionable value or of no substantial value OR project	

along with the implementation responsibilities of each partner	beyond the level they are expected to teach to students; 2) model and provide opportunities to learn about content-specific instructional strategies with research evidence for improved student achievement; and 3) align with the Tennessee Academic Standards in math or science. Components fit together into a well-integrated model that provides opportunities for significant teacher learning and support for effective implementation. All activities are likely to be effective and no inappropriate activities are included.	questionable value. Most activities are aligned to the Tennessee Academic Standards in math or science. Components appear to be designed to operate independently, not building on or reinforcing each other.	activities are not included.	
Explains in detail how selected project activities support needs and objectives	Each of the major activities directly addresses one or more of the needs and objectives established. Each of the objectives is addressed by one or more major activities. The degree of attention to each objective is sufficient to expect significant progress to be achieved.	Major activities address one or more of the needs and/or objectives. Activities are generally linked to needs and objectives of projects OR some objectives do not appear to be addressed in project activities.	Activities are listed but no description is included or the description is so vague that a direct correlation to the needs and objectives is not possible or appears unrelated.	
Provides a description of the current research in mathematics and/or science education to support selected project activities	Includes current scientifically-based research from multiple sources on effective PD for mathematics/science teachers/students specifically. Connects research to the selected activities.	Includes sufficient research on effective professional learning strategies to support most of the project activities. All activities follow the research base.	Limited data on the research-based for selected activities is presented OR activities do not follow the research base.	
Provides evidence that the scope of the project is realistic and there is sufficient capacity of the partners to support the	The narrative provides supporting evidence of sufficient capacity of the partners to support the scale and scope of the project (especially the	The narrative provides some evidence of capacity of the partners to support the scale and scope of the project but more evidence is	The narrative may or may not state the capacity of the partners to support the scale and scope of the project, but in either case does not provide the	

scale and scope of the project (especially the number of participants)	number of participants).	needed to create confidence that the project can be implemented successfully.	evidence necessary.	
Provides a table with project components and contact hours associated with each one	A table is provided and included all the required information.	A table is provided but lacks all the information requested.	No table is included.	
Includes a specific timeline of activities	A timeline is provided and includes all the required information	A timeline is provided but lacks some information needed to fully understand the project's scope	Timeline is limited or not included.	
TOTAL POINTS				
POINT JUSTIFICATION/REVIEW COMMENTS (REQUIRED):				
Project Management Plan (15 points possible)				
Indicator	Exceeds Minimum Requirements 5 points	Meets Requirements 3 points	Does Not Meet Requirements 1 point	Points Awarded
Provides a description of how the project will be administered that supports the scope and administrative requirements of the project	Clearly describes how the day-to-day management of the project will be executed. Identifies personnel involved in decision-making, budgeting, and making implementation adjustments to activities and expenditures. Roles, responsibilities, and time commitments of personnel involved in project management are described. If a Management Team is to be formed, team members are identified, schedule of meetings is provided and decision-making process is described. Management plan strongly supports the scope and administrative requirements of the project.	Provides some detail of the day-to-day management of the project; AND/OR Roles, responsibilities and time commitments are vague and the decision-making process is unclear; AND/OR More detail is needed to determine whether the management plan supports the scope and administrative requirements of the project.	The management plan is poorly described and/or appears to be inadequate to support the scope and administrative requirements of the project.	

Identifies each of the primary partners and describes in detail the role they will serve in helping the project achieve its objectives	All primary partners are fully engaged in the project management and oversight. Activities in the implementation plan are tied to partners' missions. Strong evidence presented to justify the number of quality partners who will carry out the proposed activities. Qualifications are provided for partners who demonstrate highly aligned expertise for the particular role each will serve.	Not all primary partners are fully engaged in project management and oversight. All primary partners are identified and appear to have satisfactory experience/expertise to successfully carry out the roles they are assigned.	Few primary partners are identified and the number appears to be inadequate for the scope of the project AND/OR those identified lack qualifications, experience, or expertise to successfully carry out their roles.	
Identifies the fiscal agent and person responsible for overseeing the project's fiscal activities	The fiscal agent and the person responsible for overseeing the project's fiscal activities are clearly identified.	The fiscal agent is identified but the person overseeing the project's fiscal activities is not.	Neither the fiscal agent nor the person responsible for the project's fiscal activities are identified.	
Total Points				
POINT JUSTIFICATION/REVIEW COMMENTS (REQUIRED):				
Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (30 points possible)				
Indicator	Exceeds Minimum Requirements 5 points	Meets Requirements 3 points	Does Not Meet Requirements 1 point	Points Awarded
Names and identifies credentials program evaluation personnel and their responsibilities	A specific person/contractor has been named external evaluator and has experience in the field of project evaluation for mathematics and/or science professional development. Responsibilities are clearly identified and described.	A specific external evaluator is named, but their credentials are unclear regarding expertise for evaluating mathematics and/or science professional development OR responsibilities are not clearly identified and described.	An external evaluator is not named OR is not independent of the project.	
Describes an overall evaluation plan that uses multiple measures to gather appropriate formative and summative data on project	The evaluation plan is designed to gather appropriate information about each project objective, using both quantitative and qualitative methods. For each objective, an	The evaluation plan addresses project objectives overall, but it is not clear how each objective will be measured and reported. OR	The description of the evaluation plan is unclear or incomplete OR the plan focuses solely on some objectives and excludes the others.	

objectives	evaluation table clearly lists suitable data to be collected, the instruments or protocols used, and target audience for the data collection. Mechanisms are described for gathering ongoing formative feedback on project activities and participant progress and incorporating it into project planning.	The evaluation gives insufficient attention to gathering and using formative data.		
Describes a credible evaluation design and appropriate instruments and protocols to be used	Evaluation design includes collecting data from both the participant group and a similar comparison group (random assignment preferred but not required). Pre/post measures are collected for both groups, with statistical analysis comparing pre/post changes. Size of the participant and comparison groups is sufficient for the analysis to detect meaningful differences. Instruments to be used for teacher or student content assessment have a significant objective component (not just self-report) and have documented validity and reliability.	Evaluation design may include a comparison group. At a minimum, pre/post measures are collected from the participant group to document changes during the project. Number of teachers is sufficient for statistical analysis. Instruments to be used for teacher or student content assessment have a significant objective component (not just self-report), but validity and reliability are not discussed or are not available.	Evaluation design includes only post-testing participants. Baseline data are not collected to enable changes to be measured. OR Teacher or student content assessment is by self-report measures only; no objective assessment is included.	
Presents a detailed timeline of the evaluation activities	Timeline is clear and specific about evaluation- related activities and when they will occur. Timing and scope of activities are reasonable when compared to the typical school year. Measures/instruments are clearly identified as well as the number of and classification of the participants.	Timeline is presented but does not include ALL of the required information OR is only very general.	Timeline is not available OR is so generic that no assessment of its quality or reasonableness can be made.	
Presents a research design to investigate the effects of the professional development	The research component is designed to yield credible information about the PD approach taken by the project	The proposal contains a research component, but it lacks clarity as to the nature of the information to be	A research component is not included OR is not distinct from the project's summative evaluation.	

model chosen	that can be used by others working in this domain. (Examples of such information could include: generalizing results beyond the participant group; identifying factors in the PD model and their contribution to the outcomes observed; examining system barriers and supports that impact implementing the PD model; etc.) The design is appropriate to the nature and scale of the project and is likely to produce useable knowledge.	generated OR has design issues that make it unlikely to yield the intended information OR is unclear about who will be involved in carrying out the research.		
Presents a method of disseminating results of the research as a part of planned activities	A method of disseminating results of the research is included as part of the planned activities that will include presentation of successful strategies and curricula and lessons learned.	Disseminating results of the research is included as part of the planned activities but no details are provided as to how or when.	Disseminating results of the research is not described.	
TOTAL POINTS				
POINT JUSTIFICATION / REVIEW COMMENTS (REQUIRED):				
Project Personnel (15 Points Possible)				
Indicator	Exceeds Minimum Requirements 5 points	Meets Requirements 3 points	Does Not Meet Requirements 1 point	Points Awarded
Project ensures all budgeted IHE and LEA staff are fully qualified	Project's staff roster shows staff exceeds academic and work-related qualifications.	Project's staff roster shows staff meets academic and work-related qualifications.	Project's staff roster shows that not all staff are fully qualified to manage or teach the PD training.	
Project salaries are at a reasonable percent of the total proposed budget	Project salaries' time and rate schedule accurately reflect level of expertise and training. Project salaries costs include in-kind contributions from partners.	Project salaries' time and rate schedule accurately reflect level of expertise and training.	Project salaries' time and rate schedule overcompensate in comparison to time worked and skill set.	
Proposal identifies a project evaluator with appropriate credentials and relevant	Evaluator is a noted expert in this field.	Evaluator has had relevant work experience in this field.	Evaluator has little or no relevant experience in this field.	

experience				
TOTAL POINTS				
POINT JUSTIFICATION / REVIEW COMMENTS (REQUIRED):				
Sustainability: page 13 (5 Points Possible)				
Indicator	Exceeds Minimum Requirements 5 points	Meets Requirements 3 points	Does Not Meet Requirements 1 point	Points Awarded
Project proposal objectives demonstrate sustainability and plans for ongoing collaboration between teachers in LEA(s) and IHE faculty after the grant period ends.	Sustainability plan shows compelling evidence of a partnership between the IHE and LEA(s) that will extend beyond the grant period in specifically identified ways.	Sustainability plan shows evidence of a partnership between the IHE and LEAs that will extend in a general way beyond the grant period.	Sustainability plans are not definitive relative to the extent of the long-term partnership with the IHE partner and other community cohorts.	
TOTAL POINTS				
POINT JUSTIFICATION / REVIEW COMMENTS (REQUIRED):				
Budget Narrative and Summary (10 points possible)				
Indicator	Exceeds Minimum Requirements 5 points	Meets Requirements 3 points	Does Not Meet Requirements 1 point	Points Awarded
Provided budget forms for each partner as well as a total project budget Provided a budget narrative for each line item of expenditures	Budget forms for each partner are complete and correct. A Total Project Budget is provided. All budget calculations are correct. Budget narrative is included for each line item of the budget. The purpose of each line item is clear and narrative includes accurate formulas for calculating totals.	Budget forms for each partner are complete and correct. A Total Project Budget is provided. All budget calculations are correct. Budget narrative is complete but some expenditures require more detailed explanation.	Budget forms are not filled out correctly or some are missing. Numbers do not add up. Budget narrative is incomplete and the purpose of some line items is unclear.	
Aligned budget expenditures and implementation narrative	The budget and budget narrative are directly tied to the implementation and	The budget and budget narrative are directly tied to the implementation	The budget and budget narrative are not directly tied to the implementation plan.	

	clearly show how all aspects of the plan will be supported. No funds are budgeted for unrelated expenditures.	plan but it may not be clear how all aspects of the plan will be supported.		
Budget is appropriate for the scope of the activities described	The budget supports all of the project objectives and activities. Overall cost of the project clearly match services proposed, professional development outlined and/or number of teachers served. Budget is consistent with roles of the partners. Budget is adequate and does not include excessive spending on peripheral project needs.	Most elements in the implementation plan appear adequately budgeted for. Expenditures are reasonable and focus on needs. Budget expenditures may appear higher than expected for some of the proposed activities. Budget is consistent with roles of the partners.	The budget does not directly support project objectives and activities. Funds are budgeted for unrelated purposes AND/OR do not focus on needs. Budget is inconsistent with the roles of partners.	
TOTAL POINTS				
POINT JUSTIFICATION / REVIEW COMMENTS (REQUIRED):				

Overall Scores

Section	Score	Section	Score
Abstract		Project Management Plan	
Evidence of Meaningful Partnerships		Evaluation Plan and Research Design	
Results of Needs Assessments		Personnel	
Project Objectives		Sustainability	
Project Implementation Plan		Budget Narrative and Summary Forms	
Total Points Overall			

Reviewer's Funding Recommendations

Check the appropriate box and provide comments if needed

☐

I would support funding for this proposal as written.

Comments:

☐

I would support funding this proposal with the following recommended changes.

Recommendations:

☐

I do NOT recommend funding this proposal.

Comments: